

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 055 286

CG 006 627

AUTHOR Rubenstein, Daniel I.
TITLE An Examination of Social Participation Found among a National Sample of Black and White Elderly.
INSTITUTION Brandeis Univ., Waltham, Mass. Florence Heller Graduate School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare.
SPONS AGENCY Public Health Service (DHEW), Arlington, Va.
PUB DATE 15 Apr 71
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at Eastern Psychological Association Annual Meeting, New York, N. Y., April 15-17, 1971

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Age; Black Community; Caucasians; Demography; Disadvantaged Groups; Economic Disadvantage; Minority Groups; *Negroes; Older Adults; Racial Factors; Residential Patterns; *Senior Citizens; Social Characteristics; Social Discrimination; *Social Relations; *Socioeconomic Influences

ABSTRACT

The primary focus is on black persons, aged 65 or older. Almost 4,000 non-institutionalized black and white elderly comprised the final, nationwide sample. Various demographic data are presented, e.g., place of residence, income, marital status, education, religion, occupation, etc. for the entire sample and significant differences between black and white elderly are established. The unequal position of the black elderly is emphasized, much of it seen simply as the exacerbated continuation of earlier disadvantage. On the basis of the demographic data, as well as the results of testing his major hypotheses, the author concludes: (1) that the black elderly are with us and their living conditions are in dire need of improvement; (2) that the black elderly are no more alone and isolated than the general elderly population; and (3) that the emotional state of well being (morale) is not significantly different for black elderly than for white elderly. (TL)

For Presentation at Eastern
Psychological Assoc. Meeting,
April 15, 1971, New York City

**"AN EXAMINATION OF SOCIAL PARTICIPATION FOUND
AMONG A NATIONAL SAMPLE OF BLACK AND WHITE ELDERLY"***

Daniel I. Rubenstein
Doctoral Candidate
Florence Heller Graduate School for
Advanced Studies in Social Welfare
Brandeis University
Waltham, Massachusetts

Since the title of this symposium "Aging and Black Families" is most comprehensive, there is a need for me to direct you to my particular intent. I am focusing and commenting primarily on the Black elderly, the Black person who has aged chronologically to 65 years or more. My involvement with the Black family is based on the fact that the family and kin are the primary source for emotional support in the later years. Older people are expected to attach a relatively higher value to the emotional aspects of life as other social functions diminish. They are expected to develop a greater orientation to affective, expressive, and affectional goals (Rosow 1967). Consequently, the family and kinship system becomes the major social institution for the social participation of elderly people. At a time of life when ones emotional security is so greatly challenged (Simpson and McKinney 1969) one's family and kin are expected

*"The research upon which this analysis was based was supported by U.S.P.H.S. grants #EP00654 and EC 00101. Kermit Schooler, Principal Investigator.

to provide the necessary support for one's morale or well-being. I am not studying the Black family as an institution.

In this presentation, I will (1) identify and describe the Black older person, and (2) examine their social participation (in comparison with White aged) with their family and kin.

Social participation is here defined as the activity with other people that contributes to one's social relationships which he comes to depend on for emotional support and responsiveness and which maintain him in many subtle ways (Lehr and Rudinger 1969).

To provide a framework for this examination, one assumption is made and one hypothesis is posed. It is assumed that:

There are demographic differences between Black and White elderly; that is, income, marital status, education, occupation, and religion when examined by sex, residential location and race are expected to differ significantly.

It is hypothesized that:

Household situations are different for Black and White elderly. It is proposed that these differences show that the elderly Black are more likely to live alone or in household situations without a spouse and that White elderly are more likely to live with a spouse as a couple, or in household situations with a spouse. It is further hypothesized that Black elderly persons living alone or without a spouse have a low state of morale or well-being in old age.

The data utilized in this analysis is from the data collected from professionally administered questionnaires, in a National Senior Citizen Survey carried out during 1968 by the Brandeis University Heller Research Center as part of its research program of measuring "Residential Physical Environment and Health of the Aged". The program was under the direction of Dr. Kermit Schooler.

The universe of the study consisted of the non-institutional population of persons 65 years of age and older living in the continental United States (excluding the states of Alaska and Hawaii). A multi-stage pre-listed area probability sample covering persons 65 years of age and over living in households was drawn. Four-hundred Census Enumeration Districts and 798 area segments within these districts were selected in the first and second stages of the sample. The third stage of sampling, a prelisting of all households containing one or more persons 65 years of age and older was prepared for all but 29 of the 798 segments. This resulted in a listing of 51,523 listed households. A subsampling of these households revealed a total sample of 6,328 households in which eligible respondents were contacted. In those households where more than one person was eligible for interviewing a further sample was selected so that no more than one individual per household would be interviewed. The total number of completed interviews acceptable to Audits and Surveys was 4,007. This was further reduced to 3,996

because of technical difficulties encountered in the coding. The subsample used in this analysis includes only Blacks and Whites N = 3827 (Whites N = 3340, Blacks N = 487) and does not include others (Oriental, Spanish, Puerto Rican, etc. N = 169). (Audits and Surveys 1968)

However, the sample numbers here are corrected for a more representational accuracy. (Sellitz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook, 1966). The weighted and corrected numbers in this study will appear as: Total N = 3827 (Black N = 408 and White N = 3419).

Getting to know the Black elderly person from literature is most difficult. In the field most related to the social process of aging, Social Gerontology, very little can be found (Rubenstein 1971, Jackson 1971). Seeking the Black elderly in the writings on family life is equally non-productive. Not only are the elderly missing, but Billingsly (1970) also finds "no area of American life more glaringly ignored, more distorted, or more systematically disvalued than the black family life." In writings based solely on the Black family (Bernard 1966, Frazier 1968, Billingsly 1968, Willie 1970), little or no attention is paid the elderly. Some meager comments can be found in early research on Blacks and in historical writings on Blacks. (Dubois 1908, Johnson 1930, Apthekar 1943, Davis, Gardner and Davis 1948, Kardner and Ovsey 1951, Quarles 1961, Drake and Cayton 1962, Wade 1965, Franklin 1969, Meir and Rudwick 1970).

When W.E.B. Dubois studied the Negro family about 65 years ago (Dubois 1908) he felt a need to connect present conditions with the African past, "This" he explained "is not because Negro-Americans are Africans, or can trace an unbroken social history from Africa, but because there is a distinct nexus between Africa and America which, though broken and perverted, is nevertheless not to be neglected by the careful student."

In an attempt to be the careful student I did pursue the nexus between America and Africa to discover the elderly in Black Africa. This too was not productive because the term age is commonly understood to refer to social and not necessarily to physical age; in many cases this "social age" will coincide approximately with physical age, but in others they will vary widely. Age-mates are thus not persons who are of the same biological age, but by definition persons who are initiated together, or during the same period, into a social group of a certain type, and that is known in the literature as age-set, age-class or age-grade. (Prins 1953, Forde 1951, Simmons 1945). Not being able to identify age chronologically and encountering cultural and environmental behavior most different from that experienced in America limits what one can transfer to the knowledge about Black elderly in America.

Nevertheless, there is some knowledge about the Black elderly that can be built on. Some is impressionistic and ranges from one view that Blacks bring to their older years

"a whole lifetime of economic and social indignities, a lifetime of struggle to get and keep a job, more often than not at unskilled hard labor, a life time of overcrowded, substandard housing in slum neighborhoods, of inadequate medical care, of unequal opportunities for education and the cultural and social activities that nourish the spirit, a lifetime of second-class citizenship, a lifetime of watching their children learn the high cost of being a Negro in America." (National Urban League) While on the other hand an expressed view is "that black aging populations are inclined to be robust, healthy, and well adjusted." (Elan 1970)

Beyond the impressionistic there is some data from governmental census information that when put together can portray a generalized picture of the Black elderly. (Demographic Sources)

This profile shows that White persons make up less than 90% of the total population but 92% of the older population. This is attributed to racial difference in life expectancy. (Life expectancy for whites is 73.7 for females and 66.9 for males but for the non-whites is 70.5 and 63.5.) At the end of 1962, persons aged 65 or over in the U.S. numbered about 17 1/2 million, ~~or 87% were non-white (90% of the non-white are Black).~~ Non-whites were slightly more than 11% ~~of the total American population but only 6% of the 65 plus population.~~ At the present time, Whites make up about 93.9%

of the aged population. About half of the Black elderly will reside inner city of the metropolitan area (48%) with 13% residing in the suburbs. While 39% of the Black elderly will reside in non-metropolitan areas, of these only 6% will be found on farms, leaving 33% in non-farm non-metropolitan areas.

The low income status of the adult during his working years presages his low income status in old age. An unemployment rate of twice that of Whites, low educational attainment, market place discrimination, and other such factors are also contributive to low income among Blacks. The 1963 survey of the aged reported 1/2 of the non-white couples sixty-five and over had money income in 1962 totaling less than \$1,960. It further reported total (median) money income of White: married couples \$2,955, non-married men \$1,390 and non-married women \$1,060 and Non-White: married couples \$1,960, non-married men \$1,100 and non-married women \$795. In 1964, the median income of Black families (\$3,839) increased by 11% over the 1963 level, but was still 44% below that of the White families. Among Black older Americans 42% of the families headed by older persons and 75% of the individuals living alone or with non-relatives are living in poverty. (For Whites this was 17% families and 47% alone were impoverished). Blacks receive proportionately less Social Security, less Railroad Retirement, less investment income, and less income

7

from insurance and considerably less savings than Whites. To the contrary, Black elderly receive more Public Assistance and depend more on their own and/or a spouses income. There are significant differences in the marital status of the White and Black populations. Relatively fewer Blacks were married and among the married, there was greater likelihood that the married couple would not be living together. One out of the 5 Black married women are living apart from their husbands but only 1 of 2 White women are in this situation.

Because of their shorter life expectancy and a considerably higher marriage disruption rate, fewer Blacks aged 65 and over than White persons of that age are still married and living with a spouse. Considerably more of the Black women have no husbands' income to count on in old age. Because of their inferior earning capacity, more Black men than White men never marry and so face retirement and old age alone, with no possibility of turning to a wife or grown children to ease health care or financial stress....It has also been noted that because a non-white woman is more likely to be non-married, that is, minus a husband, by the time she reached age 65, and if she does not qualify for a benefit in her own right through her own work record for social security benefits, she may well have to look for public assistance....Because relatively more of the Black recipients of old-age assistance (public assistance) live in low income South, Black recipients as a group receive somewhat smaller assistance payments.

84

The Decennial Census of 1960 shows relatively fewer of the Black aged enjoying the benefit of home ownership and relatively more living in housing units needing repair or without adequate facilities, dilapidated, that is, housing that "in its present condition endangers the health, safety or well being of the occupants". Because older people in general continue to live on in quarters they have occupied for some time, the inferior housing status of the Black aged is undoubtedly a continuation of earlier disadvantage rather than solely a reflection of current inadequate income. The Black enters upon retirement (more forced than voluntary), with little savings, more often than not without an owned home, and with little else in the way of private pensions or other resources to add to any public program benefits to which he is entitled.

For the older Black in our society, the experience of being without cash, food and comfort is not new -- he has lived with it all his life. But in his later years, he has less physical vigor, fewer resources than ever and, worst of all, he is finally confirmed in his lifelong hopelessness. Blacks are more likely to die before 65 (sixty-five). They are more subject to disabling illness, get less adequate medical care and less assistance in meeting its costs. The pattern of health facilities and services in hospitals, clinics, homes, etc., have not allowed for adequate care of the Black.

These facts and interpretations may contribute to a description and image of the current phenomenon of the Black elderly.

Now, let me add further to this description from my assumption that there are demographic differences between Black and White elderly. In my study, I have found:

AGE

The ages of this Black and White sample exhibits a declining proportion in the successive age groups; one that would be expected of an aging population.

Table 1-1

<u>Age Array by Race</u>		
<u>Age</u>	<u>Black</u> <u>N=408</u>	<u>White</u> <u>N=3419</u>
65 to 69	37.7%	34.9%
70 to 74	30.8	29.6
75 to 79	17.8	20.8
80 to 84	8.3	9.9
85 to 89	3.4	3.2
90 plus	1.9	1.1
Not ascertained	.3	.6
	<u>X Y</u>	<u>X Z</u>
Total	100.2	100.1

X inflated figure because of rounding errors in computation

Y mean 72.9, median 71.7, standard deviation 6.6

Z mean 73.0, median 71.7, standard deviation 6.3

This population is fairly reflective of the ages in the national population, as of 1969, where it has been determined that sixty-three percent of the population (63%) will be under 75 years of age, thirty-one percent (31%) are 75 to 84 and six percent (6%) are 85 plus. (Brotman 1969)

Table 1-2

Age by Race in Comparison with National Norm

<u>Age</u>	<u>National Norm</u>	<u>Sample Black N=408</u>	<u>Sample White N=3419</u>
65 - 74	67%	68.5	64.5
75 - 84	27%	26.1	30.7
85 +	6%	6.3	4.3
NA	--	0.3	0.6
TOTAL	100%	100.2%	100.1%

The differences between the Black and White age groupings do not appear to be significant. However, contrary to the finding that life expectancy for Whites is seven years (7) greater than Blacks, (Fact Sheet 1967) the Black sample is 2% higher than the Whites in the 85+ age category where it would be expected to be lower.¹

¹ The national norm is based on total population figures that include institutionalized elderly. Since our sample is based on only non-institutionalized elderly, and that Blacks have not been found in many institutions, the comparison would tend to understate the White elderly position. Considering that only 5% of the elderly are in institutions, the understatement would be minimal.

RACE

The racial (Black and White) composition of this sample is: White 89% (N = 3419), Black 11% (N = 408). While White persons make up less than 90% of the total population but 92% of the older population, (AOA Public No .46) the 11% Black is 3% higher than the 8% national norm. The racial decrease in aging is expected because of a difference in life expectancy; however, this is not found here.

When examining the male-female proportion within the racial grouping:

Table 1-3

Sex by Racial Grouping

	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>
Male	37% (N=151)	40% (N=1381)
Female	<u>63% (N=257)</u>	<u>60% (N=2038)</u>
Total	100% (N=408)	100% (N=3419)

The male-female ratio for both groups is consistent with what would be expected in a random sample.

SEX

The sex distribution of the sample is consistent with the national population; in the nation 43% are men and 57% are women. (Facts on Aging AOA No 146)

Table 1-4

Sex in Comparison with National Norm

	<u>National Norm</u>	<u>Study Sample (N = 3827)</u>
Male	43%	40% (N=1532)
Female	<u>57%</u>	<u>60% (N=2295)</u>
Total	100%	100%

Residential Location¹

Sixty-nine percent (69%) of the sample resided in a non-rural location and thirty-one percent (31%) resided in a rural location. While U.S. Government statistics (Facts on Aging AOA No 146) show, for the elderly, a 60% metropolitan and 40% non-metropolitan residential pattern, a comparison with the sample cannot be made, due to different area definitions.

Sex by Residential Location

The sex distribution in the rural and non-rural location reflects a proportional difference similar to the male and female difference found in the total sample population (female 60% and male 40%).

Table 1-5

Sex by Residential Location

	<u>Rural (N=1180)</u>	<u>Non-Rural (N=2647)</u>
Female	58% (N=682)	61% (N=1614)
Male	<u>42% (N=498)</u>	<u>39% (N=1033)</u>
Total	100%	100%

¹This designation was determined by the population of the location in which respondent resided. A location of over 2500 was designed as non-rural and an area under 2500 was designated as rural.

Race by Residential Location

A small difference in racial distribution is found between rural and non-rural locations.

Table 1-6

Residential Location by Race

	Black (N=408)	White (N=3419)	Total
Rural (N=1180)	.09 (N=106)	.91% (N=1074)	100%
Non-rural (N=2467)	.11 (N=302)	.89% (N=2345)	100%

Race and Sex by Residential Location

To gain a more instant perspective of this sample population the two previous tables are combined:

Table 1-7

Race and Sex by Residential Location

	MALE (N=1532)		FEMALE (N=2295)	
	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>White</u>
Rural	3% (N=44)	30% (N=454)	3% (N=62)	27% (N=620)
Non-Rural	<u>7% (N=107)</u>	<u>60% (N=927)</u>	<u>8% (N=195)</u>	<u>62% (N=1418)</u>
Total	10%	90%	11%	89%

Income

The analysis of income will reflect the economic difficulties of elderly and quite dramatically the poor plight of the rural Black.

The income reported here is inclusive of all income from different sources:¹

Table 1-8

Male Income - Controlled for Location and Race

<u>Income</u>	<u>MALE</u>				<u>All Males</u>
	<u>Rural White</u>	<u>Non-Rural White</u>	<u>Rural Black</u>	<u>Non-Rural Black</u>	
Under 1,000	8.0	4.3	35.2	6.9	6.5
1,000 to 1,999	26.3	17.1	35.9	45.4	22.4
2,000 to 2,999	33.7	36.3	19.6	22.0	34.1
3,000 to 3,999	10.1	14.0	9.3	16.4	12.9
4,000 to 4,999	9.8	7.5	0.0	1.8	7.6
5,000 to 6,999	4.7	10.1	0.0	6.3	7.9
7,000 to 9,999	3.1	5.7	0.0	0.7	4.4
10,000 to 14,999	2.7	1.8	0.0	0.5	1.9
15,000 Or More	1.7	3.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
Column Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 167.83 p < .001

¹ This information was gathered with the query that "We're trying to study the many different sources of income among people 65 years of age and older. Would you please tell me if you (and your husband/wife) have received any income during the past 12 months..from the following sources (read list slowly and check source below) includes: wages, salaries, fees, profits, rents, insurance payments, interest and dividends, pensions, retirement, soc. sec., OAA, vet benif., un-employment benif., and others and family subsistence allowances. Above were totaled for Total Yearly Income."

Table 1-9

Female Income - Controlled for Location and Race

<u>Income</u>	<u>FEMALE</u>				
	<u>Rural White</u>	<u>Non-Rural White</u>	<u>Rural Black</u>	<u>Non-Rural Black</u>	<u>All Females</u>
Under 1,000	20.5	16.6	65.8	38.8	20.8
1,000 to 1,999	30.4	25.5	14.3	34.3	27.3
2,000 to 2,999	31.1	35.5	16.6	13.7	31.9
3,000 to 3,999	7.9	7.6	2.7	8.8	7.7
4,000 to 4,999	3.0	6.2	0.6	1.8	4.8
5,000 to 6,999	4.8	4.4	0.0	2.6	4.2
7,000 to 9,999	0.9	2.5	0.0	0.0	1.8
10,000 to 14,999	0.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.6
15,000 Or More	<u>1.0</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0.9</u>
Column Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square 183.44 P < .001

According to our figures, the Black condition, both male and female, is strikingly impoverished. When considering that 40% of the elderly are living in poverty¹ and that 71.1% of the rural Black males and 80.2% of the rural Black females are in poverty, the difference is most significant. We find that almost no rural Black elderly have earnings beyond \$4,000, with very few non-rural Blacks exceeding that figure. We also find that rural incomes are lower than non-rural incomes, female incomes are lower than male incomes. It can readily be concluded that the differences between Black and White incomes are significant and the Black incomes are far below that of Whites.

Educational Attainment

Considering that half of the older people never got to high school and that 17% are functionally illiterate, (AOA Publication No 146) and the median years of education for persons over 65 is eight; one can expect of the elderly low educational attainment.

¹ Commissioner John Martin, U.S. Department of HEW, Admin. of Aging, testified before the sub-committee on aging, Sept. 1969, and stated that thirty percent (30%) of the population who are sixty-five (65) and over live below the poverty line established for purpose of the Social Security Administration Poverty Index, and another ten percent (10%) have incomes only slightly above the poverty line, making a total of forty per cent (40%) of this age group who are in poverty or near poverty.

Table 1-10

Male Educational Attainment Controlled for Location and Race

MALE					
<u>Education</u>	<u>Rural White</u>	<u>Non-Rural White</u>	<u>Rural Black</u>	<u>Non-Rural Black</u>	<u>All Males</u>
None	4.0	3.6	27.2	18.7	5.4
1 to 7th	34.8	28.3	64.8	48.7	32.7
Grade School	32.0	23.9	3.3	10.4	24.8
1 to 3 yrs. High	13.6	16.0	3.4	14.3	14.8
High School	5.5	13.0	1.4	1.5	9.6
1 to 3 yrs. College	7.3	7.5	0.0	4.3	7.0
College Grad.	<u>2.7</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2.2</u>	<u>5.7</u>
Column Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square 193.35 $p < .001$

Table 1-11

Female Educational Attainment Controlled for Sex, Location and Race

FEMALE					
<u>Education</u>	<u>Rural White</u>	<u>Non-Rural White</u>	<u>Rural Black</u>	<u>Non-Rural Black</u>	<u>All Females</u>
None	1.7	3.7	20.8	13.0	4.4
1 to 7th	27.8	26.4	62.8	49.8	29.8
Grade School	29.6	25.1	6.2	19.5	25.3
1 to 3 yrs. High	21.6	15.6	3.4	7.9	16.2
High School	10.9	14.2	3.6	5.9	12.3
1 to 3 yrs. College	6.0	9.6	2.2	2.8	7.9
College Grad.	2.5	5.4	1.0	1.1	4.1
Column Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Chi Square = 227.22 < P .001

Tables 1-10 and 1-11 show for the White population an approximation of the census expectation (Fact Sheet on Aging AOA No .46) of 65% with 8 years or less, 25% with high school, and 10% with college, with a higher attainment for the White non-rural male and female over their rural counterparts.

However, with the Black population there is a significantly lower educational attainment, high proportions of no formal education. The Black rural male and female is less educated than his or her non-rural counterpart and the rural Black male attaining

a level slightly lower than the female and lower as well to the Black male and female in non-rural locations. We can conclude, from observing our frequency distribution, that the Whites have a higher educational attainment. The Black rural male is the least educated. We also note that males show a slightly higher educational attainment than females in all categories excepting the Black rural where the female has a higher educational level.

Religion

In the total population of the United States, for all ages of those indicating a religious preference, it has been found that 66% are Protestant, 26% are Catholic, 3% are Jews and 5% are others. (Miller 1964) In this study we find:

Table 1-12

Male Religion - Controlled for Location and Race

MALE					
<u>Religion</u>	<u>Rural White</u>	<u>Non-Rural White</u>	<u>Rural Black</u>	<u>Non-Rural Black</u>	<u>Row Total</u>
Catholic	11.7	28.8	0.9	9.5	21.6
Protestant	78.7	61.4	94.9	84.9	69.2
Jewish	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	2.5
Other	0.8	1.2	0.9	0.0	1.0
None	8.8	4.4	3.4	5.7	5.8
Column Total	29.6	60.5	2.9	7.0	100.0

Chi Sq. = 118.61 p > .001

Table 1-13

Female Religion - Controlled for Location and Race

FEMALE					
<u>Religion</u>	<u>Rural White</u>	<u>Non-Rural White</u>	<u>Rural Black</u>	<u>Non-Rural Black</u>	<u>Row Total</u>
Catholic	15.4	34.2	0.0	3.2	25.6
Protestant	81.6	59.7	99.4	93.9	69.6
Jewish	0.2	3.5	0.0	0.0	2.2
Other	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.8	0.6
None	<u>2.3</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>0.6</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>
Column Total	27.0	61.8	2.7	8.5	100.0

Chi Sq. = 207.00 $p > .001$

In the examination of religious preference we do find that the female tend to have more religious preference than do males and that the group with the highest preference is the Black Rural (both Male and Female). We also find the Black and White predominantly Protestant with the low percentage of Black Catholics to be found in the non-rural location. The small Jewish population is located in the non-rural area. Catholic preference is definitely higher in the non-rural, while Protestant preference tends to be higher in the rural location. Of those indicating no religious preference, we find the rural white male the highest with the non-rural Black male the second highest.

Marital Status

That most men are husbands and most women are widows is also a truism in this study. This total sample does approximate the national census: (Brotman 1969)

Table 1-14

MARITAL STATUS

	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
Married	71.3%	36.0%
Widowed	19.5	54.4
Divorced	2.6	1.9
Separated		
Never Married	6.6	7.7
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%

Table 1-15

Marital Status of Male Controlled for Location and Race

<u>Marital</u>	<u>Rural White</u>	<u>Non-Rural White</u>	<u>Rural Black</u>	<u>Non-Rural Black</u>	<u>Male Row Total</u>
Married	77.6	75.3	71.1	59.4	74.7
Widowed	16.7	16.7	22.5	27.9	17.7
Divorced	1.1	1.1	2.2	2.4	1.2
Separated	1.3	1.5	2.7	4.8	1.7
Never Married	3.2	5.5	1.6	5.5	4.7
Column Total	29.6	60.6	2.9	7.0	100.0

Chi Sq. = 24.61 P = <.0167

Table 1-16

<u>Marital Status of Female Controlled for Location and Race</u>					
Marital	<u>Rural</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Non-Rural</u> <u>White</u>	<u>Rural</u> <u>Black</u>	<u>Non-Rural</u> <u>Black</u>	Female Row <u>Total</u>
Married	50.0	41.8	37.4	27.1	42.6
Widowed	44.1	49.0	56.9	58.2	48.7
Divorced	1.3	2.2	0.5	3.2	2.0
Separated	0.9	1.0	1.9	6.8	1.5
Never Married	3.7	6.0	3.2	4.8	5.2
Column Total	27.0	61.8	2.7	8.5	100.0

Raw chi sq. = 74.20 P = <0.001

We find that Blacks have a lower marriage and a higher widow rate than do Whites with a highly significant difference in the Black non-rural category. These statistics do indicate the non-rural (Black and White, male and female) have a higher never married percentage than the rural. Rural elderly tend to have a greater married status and lower widowed status than do the non-rural. Blacks, in most categories, have a higher divorced and separated status than whites, excepting with the rural Black females who show an extremely low divorce status. This data also shows a higher separation status for Black male and females with a significant higher rate for non-rural Black male and females. It can be said that Whites are more married and less widowed than Blacks and that Blacks have a higher incidence of divorce and separation than Whites, ~~and that more Blacks never marry than Whites.~~

Occupation

As would be expected, the data does reflect male and female occupational differences.

Table 1-17

Male Occupation - Controlled for Location and Race
(The kind of work you did most of your life)

Major Job	MALE				Male Row Total
	Rural White	Non-Rural White	Rural Black	Non-Rural Black	
None	2.1	0.6	0.0	4.5	1.3
Prof.	8.2	7.6	0.0	3.3	7.3
Managers Prop. Owner	40.0	27.6	11.4*	8.2	30.6
Clerical	3.9	6.2	0.0	7.1	5.4
Sales	1.5	4.8	0.0	0.8	3.4
Craftsman Foreman	22.5	25.0	3.6	12.2	22.8
Operators	11.0	17.4	11.2	6.0	14.5
Service	1.4	4.7	1.4	20.6	4.7
Common Laborers	9.5	6.0	72.4*	37.2	10.0
Column Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*These are corrected estimates due to coding errors χ^2 was not computed.

Table 1-18

Female Occupation - Controlled for Location and Race
(The kind of work you did most of your life)

FEMALE

<u>Major Job</u>	<u>Rural White</u>	<u>Non-Rural White</u>	<u>Rural Black</u>	<u>Non-Rural Black</u>	<u>Row Total</u>
None	54.1	36.3	24.9	21.8	39.5
Prof.	5.6	8.3	3.3	2.6	6.9
Managers Prop. Owner	5.9	6.0	5.5*	5.6	6.1
Clerical	6.9	13.9	0.0	2.5	10.7
Sales	5.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	4.2
Craftsman Foreman	1.6	3.4	0.0	0.6	2.6
Operators	8.3	14.2	2.6	5.1	11.5
Service	11.7	13.1	37.0	49.7	16.5
Common Laborers	<u>0.5</u>	<u>0.5</u>	<u>26.7*</u>	<u>12.1</u>	<u>2.0</u>
Column Total	26.9	61.8	2.7	8.5	100.0

Of those persons that have no major job the male Black-White differences show that the non-rural Black is the highest and rural Black being the lowest. One could say that the rural Black male has always worked while the non-rural Black male may not have been fully and consistently employed.

* These are corrected estimates due to coding errors X^2 was not computed.

It is quite evident in this analysis that a high percentage of the rural Black males will be found statistically as common laborers and farm workers and the non-rural Black males as a laborers and service workers while the White elderly male is more likely to be found in manager, proprietor and craftsman, foreman roles. For the women there is a significant number of white (both rural and non-rural) not having major jobs, with fair percentages for Blacks as well. This would indicate (moreso in rural areas and for White women) that the woman was in the home. We do find that for Black women, that their tasks would be found in service and common labor. It is also interesting to note that no Black rural women were found in clerical, sales and craftsman, foreman jobs and while a small percentage of Black non-rural women were in clerical, virtually none were found in sales and craftsman, foreman positions.

In occupation roles and tasks, for Blacks and Whites, there are most significant and distinctive differences.

Summary

It is most clear, and without equivocation, that there are significant demographic differences between the Black and White Elderly. The Black elderly may well be found in the upper reach of the later years where he or she was not expected. Contrary to other experiences, we do find the Black and White

racial composition in this sample similar to that of the national population and not giving rise to the assumption that the Black does not live to older age. The seven year mortality difference would not be evident here. We do find that the White elderly have higher incomes and that 70 to 80% of the Black elderly are in or near poverty. The Black have a lower formal educational attainment than do the White elderly and consistent with this finding, the Black is also found in greater proportions in the labor and service occupations. The Blacks are predominantly Protestant with some Catholics in the non-rural areas. While White elderly are also predominantly Protestants, they have a greater number with Catholic preferences. Blacks have a lower number now married than Whites and also more widows than Whites and Blacks will be found to be more separated and divorced than Whites. ~~More Blacks than Whites have never married.~~

I have posed the hypothesis that household situations are different for Black and White elderly persons; and that these differences are that elderly Black persons are more likely to live alone or in household situations without a spouse and that White elderly persons are more likely to live with a spouse as a couple, or in household situations with a spouse. And consequently, I proposed, that the Black elderly living alone or without a spouse have a lower state of morale or well being in old age, than do the White elderly who live with spouse in couples, or in household situations with a spouse.

This hypothesis was constructed in the realization that Blacks have been isolated (or prevented) from social participation. Edwards (1968) said that, "isolation under which the Negro lived in the U.S. provided serious attenuations in his community and institutional life, and, as a result, had a profound impact upon his self conception."

Is this so for the Black elderly in their primary social institution, their household situation.

In response to the question "Does anyone live with you here," this is what was found:

Table II -1

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
White	75.5 (N=2576)	24.5 (N=835)	100%
Black	79.5 (N=324)	20.5 (N=84)	100%

This finding is most significant for it does contradict the assumption that the Black elderly are to be found more alone since they are more widowed, divorced and separated. Of course, this gives credence to Billingsly's (1968) advice that "the Negro family cannot be understood in isolation or by concentration on its fragments, or on its negative functions. The Negro family can best be understood when viewed as a varied and complex institution within the Negro community, which is in turn highly interdependent with other institutions in the wider white society."

When asked "how many people live with you here," it was found as follows:

	<u>One Person</u>	<u>Two Persons</u>	<u>Three, four or five</u>	<u>Six or more persons</u>
Black	37.0	18.6	13.9	6.0
White	54.6	12.4	7.5	.9

This data further reinforces the fact that the Black elderly are not as limited in their opportunity for social participation in their households as are the White elderly who live with fewer people.

When queried as to what relation are these people in the household to you and you to them, it was found that:

Table II-3

Relation of Persons in Present Residence
(Who do you live with or who lives with you?)

<u>Situations</u>	<u>BLACK</u>	<u>WHITE</u>
<u>Alone</u>	<u>20.6%</u>	<u>24.7%</u>
<u>With Souse only</u>	<u>21.2</u>	<u>44.3</u>
<u>Nuclear Family</u>		
With Spouse and child or children only	7.1	6.1
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>7.1%</u>	<u>6.1%</u>
<u>With Spouse and Extended Family</u>		
Spouse and parent	.2	.8
Spouse, parent, and child	.9	.1
Spouse, grandchild	3.6	.5
Spouse, child, grandchild	2.0	1.2
Spouse, sib	1.1	.8
Spouse, child, sib	.0	.1
Spouse and other relative	.7	.1
Spouse, grandchild, other rel.	.8	.0
Spouse, grandchild, child, other rel.	.0	.1
Spouse, sib, other relative	.1	.0
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>9.4%</u>	<u>3.7%</u> <u>1.2%</u>

Table II-3 (Continued)

<u>With Spouse and Augmented family</u>		
Spouse and non relative	2.9	1.3
Spouse, child, non relative	.9	.0
TOTAL	<u>3.8%</u>	<u>1.3%</u>
<u>Singular with Child or Children only</u>	9.5%	6.9%
<u>Singular with Extended Family</u>		
With Parent or Parent in law	.2	.5
Grandchild	2.6	.6
Child and grandchild	9.7	3.5
Sib or sib in law	2.0	3.3
Parent and sibs	.0	.1
Child, sib	.0	.3
Child, grand child, sib	.0	.1
Other relative	4.1	.6
Child, other relative	.5	.1
Parent, grandchild, other rel	.2	.0
Child, grandchild, other rel.	1.7	.0
Sib, other relative	.4	.3
Parent, sib, other relative	.3	.0
TOTAL	<u>21.7%</u>	<u>9.4%</u>
<u>Singular with Augmented Family</u>		
With Non-Relative	5.3	2.7
Child, non-relative	.2	.2
Grand child, non-relative	.2	.0
Sibling, non-relative	.3	.1
Child, grandchild, non-rel.	.1	.0
Parent, child, other rel., non-rel.	.1	.0
TOTAL	<u>6.2%</u>	<u>3.0%</u>
<u>Not Available</u>	<u>.7%</u>	<u>.5%</u>
TOTAL	<u>100.2%</u>	<u>99.9%</u>

In summary the household situations appear as:

Summary
Residential Household Situation by Race

	BLACK	WHITE
ALONE	20.6%	24.7%
Respondent with Spouse only	21.2	44.3
Nuclear Family	7.1	6.1
Respondent and Spouse with Extended Family	9.4	3.7
Respondent and Spouse with Augmented Family	3.8	1.3
- - - - -		
Singular Respondent with Child or Children	9.5	6.9
Singular Respondent with Extended Family	21.7	9.4
Singular Respondent with Augmented Family	6.2	3.0
Not Available	.7	.5
TOTAL	100.2%	99.9%

To this point, we have found that Black and White elderly do live in different kinds of household situations, and that they are not as alone or isolated as is commonly thought. Now that we are at the point of testing the hypothesis, I wish to explain the form of the hypothesis. This conceptual form follows the

dictates of the general examinations and controversies on the Black family. Have not the so called "broken", "dis-organized", "matriarchial" or "one parent" family been the focus of Black family investigation? Our hypothesis follows this "normative expectancy" and attempts to test its validity. But in reality, my examination goes beyond this expectancy because I do believe that for the Black family and for the Black elderly, what Otto (1970) states is most profound:

"For many decades the overwhelming weight of our research has been concentrated on marital and family dysfunction and disorganization. We have studied or sought to treat the sick marriage and the sick family without any clear conceptualization or theoretical framework for what we mean by a "healthy" marriage or well-functioning family. Our efforts have focused on the pathology of the family, while neglecting family strengths."

With this caution, let us continue the examination. Are Black elderly who are not alone in household situations living without spouses and white elderly who are not living alone living in household situations with spouses:

	<u>With Spouse</u>	<u>Without Spouse</u>
<u>White</u>	55.4%	19.3%
<u>Black</u>	41.5%	37.4%

Yes, the White elderly when not alone are in household situations with a spouse moreso than Black elderly who are not alone.

Now to test the hypothesis: that Black elderly persons live alone or in household situations without a spouse and that White elderly persons live with a spouse as couples, or in household situations with a spouse. I do find that:

	<u>Alone or w/o spouse</u>	<u>Table II-6 With Spouse</u>	<u>Not Available</u>	<u>Total</u>
Black	58.0	41.5	.7	100.2
White	44.0	55.4	.5	99.9

Yes, the hypothesis is true, but not to the degree that would be expected considering the intensity of common expectation.

But how does this affect well being in old age. How are these household situations reflected in the older persons feeling about himself and his relationship to the world around him.

To measure the degree of well-being two morale factors were utilized.¹ Morale factor 1 reflects a transient response to external events and morale factor 2 accounts for the degree of sustained unhappiness.

¹ Due to limits of this paper the factor composition and weights are not explained. This information is available from the author upon request.

How is the state of well being for Black and White elderly when they live alone or with others? When examined by Morale 1 (transient response to external events) I find:

Table II-7

Does anyone live with you here by Morale 1
by sex by race

		WHITE				BLACK			
		<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>		<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>	
		No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
High Morale	1	16.2	10.8	10.6	6.3	21.5	10.5	12.3	10.5
	2	39.2	36.2	29.0	23.5	23.9	20.7	24.5	27.2
	3	21.7	25.9	26.4	28.9	13.9	25.6	30.3	24.4
	4	19.7	20.5	26.3	26.5	29.3	25.8	22.1	30.7
Low Morale	5	3.2	6.6	7.7	14.8	11.3	17.5	10.8	7.2
TOTAL		16.3	83.7	30.	70.	14.8	85.2	23.9	76.1
			100%		100%		100%		100%

This finding indicates that with both Black and White elderly more females than males live alone. Contrary to the expectancy that alone = poor morale, I do find with both Black and White elderly that those living alone do have higher morales than those living with others excepting the Black female where the difference in household situation does not indicate a significant difference in morale.

There is no significant different between Black and Whites in their levels of morale as measured by the moral factor 1 (transient response to external events).

In examing the same household situations by Morale 2 (sustained unhappiness) I find:

Table II-8

Does anyone live with you here by Morale 2
by sex by race

		WHITE				BLACK			
		Male		Female		Male		Female	
		No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
High Morale	1	0.3	2.9	1.3	3.8	0.0	3.9	0.7	8.8
	2	18.7	41.1	24.3	34.5	29.5	40.7	27.7	27.1
	3	34.6	39.4	36.6	36.8	25.6	29.5	43.0	42.5
	4	30.8	11.8	24.1	17.9	29.7	18.1	21.4	16.2
Low Morale	5	15.6	4.7	13.3	6.9	15.2	7.7	7.3	5.4
		16.3	83.7	30.	70.	14.8	85.2	23.9	76.1
		100%		100%		100%		100%	

This finding indicates what would be expected, that, by living with others one would be happier. The racial difference, here again, is not significant with the exception of a higher morale for the Black female living with others.

Since I have gone way beyond my time and the last part of the hypothesis is most extensive, I will attempt to graphically summarize the findings . When the household situations were dichotomized and tested by morale it was found generally that:

Morale 1

(Transient Response to External Events)

	<u>Alone or situation without spouse</u>	<u>Situations w/spouse</u>
High	more	less
low	less	more

Morale 4

(Sustained unhappiness)

High	less	more
low	more	less

Since the data was not broken down by race (as yet) I can only report that the morale trends for the general population in selected household situations do show that when responding to the outside world the aged alone or in a family situation without a spouse may be more secure than the elderly who lives with a spouse or with a spouse in a family situation. When examining ones morale as measured by sustained unhappiness we find the opposite. However, the applicability of this finding by race will need to be examined at another time.

Conclusions:

1. The Black elderly are with us and their living conditions are in dire need of improvement.
2. The Black elderly are no more alone and isolated than are the general elderly population.
3. The emotional state of well-being is ^{not significantly} ~~no~~ different for Black elderly than for White elderly.

My research also prompts me to conclude that:

4. We must be quite critical in our acceptance of the generalities and myths surrounding the Black elderly, and demand more thorough examinations of our most neglected and unknown population.
5. The Black elderly person (and White elderly as well) are grown and matured adults who are at that stage of life, where, in the socialization process, they socialize others, rather than being socialized themselves. It is therefore incumbent upon us to recognize that the Black elderly must not be viewed as children and adolescents.
6. As with all populations, we should expect to find similarities and differences and strengths and weakness. And we must be aware that:

"Family research seems to have become particularly prone to the whole hearted endorsement of the 'cultural homogenization' theme and to the rejection of diversity as a conceptual alternative." (Heiskanen)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Audits & Surveys, Inc. A Technical Appendix & Household Weights: National Senior Citizens Study, New York, 1968.
- Bernard, Jessie. Marriage and Family Among Negroes, Prentice Hall, Englewood, N.J., 1966.
- Billingsly, Andrew. Black Family in White America, Prentice Hall, Englewood, N. J., 1968.
- Billingsly, Andrew. "Black Families and White Social Science," Journal of Social Issues, Volume 26 Number 3, 1970, p. 127.
- Brotman, Herman B. "Every Tenth American" presented at State Conference, Iowa Commission on the Aging, at Des Moines, Iowa, on October 2, 1968, p. 4. (Data updated to May 1969 in subsequent correspondence).
- Demographic Sources: Facts on Aging, AOA Publication No. 146, U.S. Dept. HEW, May 1970. Facts About Older Americans, AOA Publication 410 U.S. Dept. HEW, May 1966. Fact Sheet on Aging, The Gerontological Society, St. Louis, Mo., 1967. Developments in Aging, 1969, A Report of the Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, Washington D.C., May 15, 1970, Orshanski, Mollie, "The Aged Negro and His Income," Social Security Bulletin, Feb. 1964, Vol. 27. Epstein, Lenore A. and Murray, Janet H. "The Aged Population of the U.S., The 1963 Social Security Survey of the Aged," U.S. Dept. HEW., Research Report No. 19; Hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Aging, Welfare and Health Needs, Sept. 10, 1969. Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate Report, 90th Congress First Session, Washington, D.C., Dec. 5-6, 1967. Hearings before the Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, 90th Congress, 2nd Session, Part 1, Washington, D.C., July 23, 1968.
- Dubois, W.E.B. (ed.) "The Negro American Family," in The American Negro His History and Literature, The Atlanta Univ. Publications, 1908, No. 13, p. 9, Arno Press and the New York Times, New York, 1968.

- Elam, Lloyd C. M.D. "Critical Factors for Mental Health in Aging Black Populations," Ethnicity, Mental Health and Aging, University of Southern California, Gerontology Center, Los Angeles, April 1970, p. 2.
- Edwards, G. Franklin. In preface to E. Franklin Frazier, "On Race Relations," University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1968.
- Facts on Aging, ADA Publication No. 146, U.S. Dept. HEW, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Admin. on Aging, May 1970.
- Fact Sheet on Aging, The Gerontological Society, Curriculum Project, 1967, St. Louis, Mo., p. 2.
- Frazier, E. Franklin. "Problems and Needs of Negro Children and Youth Resulting from Family Disorganization," Journal of Negro Education, Summer 1950, pp. 276-277.
- Frazier, E. Franklin. The Negro Family in the United States, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1968.
- Forde, Daryll. Marriage and Family Among the Yako in South Eastern Nigeria, Chap. 2, The Significance of Kinship and Age Set Systems, The International African Institute, Humphries and Co., Ltd., London, 1951.
- Heiskanen, Veronica Stolte. "The Myth of the Middle-Class Family in American Family Sociology," The American Sociologist Vol. 6 No. 1, Feb. 1971.
- Jackson, Jacqueline Johnson. "Negro Aged: Toward Needed Research in Social Gerontology", The Gerontologist, Vol. 11, Number 1, Spring 1971, pp. 52-57.
- Jahoda, Marie; Sellitz, Claire; Deutsch, Morton; Cook, Stewart W. Research Methods in Social Relations, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1966.
- Lehr, Ursula and Rudinger G. "Consistency and Change of Social Participation in Old Age," Human Development, 12:255-267 (1969).
- National Urban League, Double Jeopardy...The Older Negro in America Today, NYC, New York, 1965.

- Otto, Herbert A. The Family in Search of a Future, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1970, Introduction, p. 5.
- Prins, A.H.J. East African Age Class Systems, J.B. Wolters, Groningen, Djakarta, 1953, Chap. II, p. 9.
- Rosow, Irving. Social Integration of the Aged, The Free Press, 1967.
- Rubenstein, Daniel. "The Missing Black," unpublished paper, Brandeis University, 1971.
- Simmons, Leo W. The Role of the Aged in Primitive Society, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1945.
- Simpson, Ida H. and McKinney, John. The Social Aspects of Aging, Duke Univ. Press, 1969 (Preface).
- Willie, Charles V. The Family Life of Black People, Charles E. Merrill Co., Columbus, Ohio, 1970.

ANNOUNCING FIELD INSTRUCTION ASSIGNMENTS

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

30 AUGUST 1971 THRU 17 DECEMBER 1971

ROBERT F. KENNEDY YOUTH CENTER
Green Bag Road
Morgantown, West Virginia 26505

Field Instructor: Don Magel
Faculty Consultant: LeRoy Schultz

STUDENT	ADDRESS	ADVISOR
Mr. David Clovsky	779 Chestnut Ridge Road, Apt. 2	Harbert
Miss Sally Dodds	25 Glenn Street	Mudd
Mr. Fred Hill	990 Grand Street	Elliott
Mr. John D. Snyder	608 Jones Street	Harbert
Mr. J. Edward Stemple	3700 Collins Ferry Road	White
Mr. Harry Cartwright	145 Lorentz Avenue	White
Mr. Edwin Marosek	Rt. 4, Box 421A	Elliott
Miss Virginia Kuebler	437 Inglewood Boulevard, Apt. A	Elliott
Mr. Robert Selby	Marvin Street Extension	Elliott

RURAL MANPOWER RESEARCH & TRAINING
School of Social Work
West Virginia University

Field Instructor: Miss Emery; John Miller
Faculty Consultant: Margaret Emery

Mr. Robert Miller	LaMesa Mobile Home, Rt. 10	Stewart
Mr. Paul Ward	505 Burroughs Street, Box 31	White
Mrs. Janis Augustine	Rt. 8, Box 82C (Mileground)	Theilen

DESIGNS FOR RURAL ACTION
Capital City Building
Charleston, W. Va.

Field Instructor:
Faculty Consultant: Dr. Marjorie Buckholz

Miss Linda Fritts	P. O. Box 371	Theilen
-------------------	---------------	---------

SPECIAL M & I PROJECT
Monongalia Co. Health Dept.
Morgantown, W. Va. 26505

Field Instructor: Mrs. Antoinette Arkle
Faculty Consultant: Miss Caroline Mudd

Miss Undeen Measley	St. Clairs Mobil Homes #14, VanVoorhis Rd./Stewart
---------------------	--

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA
AREA MEDICAL OFFICE
900 Chestnut Ridge Road
Morgantown, W. Va. 26505

Field Instructor: Miss Betty Veach
Faculty Consultant: Miss Caroline Mudd

Mr. Peter Dys	Rt. 9, Box 489	Harbert
---------------	----------------	---------

FIELD INSTRUCTION ASSIGNMENTS

page 2

ROCK FORGE SETTLEMENT Sabraton, West Virginia

Field Instructor: Dr. Marjorie Buckholz
Faculty Consultant: Dr. Marjorie Buckholz

STUDENT	ADDRESS	ADVISOR
Mr. Jerry W. Snyder	Rt. 10, Box B11	Theilen
Mr. Auburn Cooper	Blvd. Mobil Homes, Osage, #6	Mudd

OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER Morgantown, W. Va. 26505

Field Instructor: Dr. Marjorie Buckholz
Faculty Consultant: Dr. Marjorie Buckholz

STUDENT	ADDRESS	ADVISOR
Mr. William Jones	457 White Avenue	Elliott
Miss Doris E. James	1241 University Avenue	Theilen

FAMILY SERVICE ASSOCIATION 364 High Street Morgantown, W. Va. 26505

Field Instructor: Mrs. Pat Keith
Mrs. Florence Porter
Faculty Consultant: Mr. Courtney Elliott

STUDENT	ADDRESS	ADVISOR
Mr. Mahlon Fiscel	101 Lough St., Westover	Elliott
Mr. Randy Augustine	Rt. 8, Box 82C (Mileground)	Elliott
Mr. John Ravenscroft	101 Newton Drive	Stewart
Mr. Victor Rutkoski	Rt. 4, Box 108	Porter
Miss Karen Roberts	Rt. 10, Box 354AA	Elliott

STUDENT COUNSELING & PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES University Health Center West Virginia University

Field Instructor: Mr. William Green
Faculty Consultant: Miss Mudd

STUDENT	ADDRESS	ADVISOR
Miss Charlotte Friend	544 Lake Street	Stewart

UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING EXPERIENCE School of Social Work West Virginia University

Field Instructor: Miss Betty Baer
Faculty Consultant: Mr. Harold White

STUDENT	ADDRESS	ADVISOR
Miss Janice Gayarski	881 E. Everly Street, Apt. 12	Theilen
Miss Rebecca Hilk	881 E. Everly Street, Apt. 12	White

MONONGALIA COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT Van Voorhis Road Morgantown, W. Va. 26505

Field Instructor: Dr. Marjorie Buckholz
Faculty Consultant: Dr. Marjorie Buckholz

STUDENT	ADDRESS	ADVISOR
Mr. Kenneth Cazin	854 1/2 Riverview Drive	Theilen

FIELD INSTRUCTION ASSIGNMENTS
page 3

MONONGALIA COUNTY SCHOOL SYSTEM
c/o School of Social Work
West Virginia University
Morgantown, W. Va. 26506

Field Instructor: Mrs. Helen Ellison
Faculty Consultant: Mr. Courtney Elliott

STUDENT	ADDRESS	ADVISOR
Miss Melinda Pettigrew	17 Glenn Street	Mudd
Mr. Richard Anderson	228 Ohio Avenue, Clarksburg, W. Va.	Elliott

UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER
Department of Psychiatry
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Field Instructor: Mrs. Pat Porterfield
Mrs. Janice Cone
Faculty Consultant: Mr. Harold White

Miss Eileen Anthony	Rt. 9, Box 2A	Schultz
Miss Maryellen Baran	3416 University Avenue	White
Miss Jean Chambers	49 Poplar Avenue, Wheeling, W. Va.	Mudd
Mrs. Bernice Cleveland	Rt. 9, Box 362B, Lot 16	White
Mrs. Sandra Goodwin	614 Springdale	Theilen
Mrs. Margaret Hale	Rt. 9, Box 480F-1, Parkway Pl.	Stewart
Miss Susan Wade	752 Weaver	Elliott
Mr. Bruce Ervin	205 Beech Ave., Philippi, W. Va.	Mudd
Mr. C. Paxon Hayes	3316 Collins Ferry Road	Theilen
Mr. Robert Pears	Boulevard Mobil Homes, Osage #6	Mudd

VALLEY COUNSELING CENTER
601 East Brockway Avenue
Morgantown, W. Va. 26505

Field Instructor: Mrs. Josephine Stewart
Faculty Consultant: Mr. Don Magel

Mr. James Gelston	324 Beechurst	Mudd
Mr. Steven Johnson	720 Hickory Lane, #4	Elliott
Mr. Frank Yake (NEED)	Rt. 4, Box 108	Schneider
Miss Beverly McCoy	3601 Collins Ferry Road, G28	Elliott
Mr. John Rouse	381 Newton Ave., Apt. 202	Snyder
Mrs. Marian Roberts	2093 University Avenue	Snyder

SCOTT'S RUN SETTLEMENT
Osage, West Virginia

Field Instructor: Dr. Marjorie Buckholz
Faculty Consultant: Dr. Marjorie Buckholz

Mr. Robert Cassin	116 Ohio, Westover	Stewart
-------------------	--------------------	---------

HANCOCK-BROOKE MENTAL HEALTH CENTER
Weirton General Hospital
Weirton, West Virginia

Field Instructor: Mr. David Miller
Faculty Consultant: Mrs. Helen Ellison

Mr. Charles Propst	699 Burroughs Street	White
--------------------	----------------------	-------

FIELD INSTRUCTION ASSIGNMENTS
page 4

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL
Leech Farm Road
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15206

Field Instructor: Mrs. Alma Burgess
Faculty Consultant: Helen Ellison

STUDENT	ADDRESS	ADVISOR
Miss Barbara Heggie	17 Glen Street	Elliott

CHARTIERS MENTAL HEALTH & MENTAL RETARDATION CENTER, INC.
437 Railroad Street
Bridgeville, Pa. 15017

Field Instructor: Gerald W. Vest;
Richard Ney
Faculty Consultant: Helen Ellison

Mr. James Huggins	433 1/2 Pennsylvania Avenue	
Mr. Henry Kovalanchik	19 West Jefferson	Theilen
Mr. Theodore Jackson	9836 Presidential Dr., Allison Pk, Pa.	Stewart
Mr. Kenneth Karnash	201 Beechurst Avenue	Snyder
Mr. David Mandarino	201 Beechurst Avenue	Stewart

ALLEGHENY COUNTY CHAPTER OF PARC
220 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15219

Field Instructor: Wayne Hanson
Faculty Consultant: Gary Theilen

Mr. Paul DeWalt	304 Grant Street	Theilen
-----------------	------------------	---------

ALLEGHENY COUNTY BOARD OF ASSISTANCE
300 Liberty Avenue, State Office Bldg.
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222

Field Instructor:
Faculty Consultant: Dr. Marjorie Buckholz

Mr. Denis Rudy	906 Rawley Avenue	White
----------------	-------------------	-------

INFORMATION AND VOLUNTEER SERVICES OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY
200 Ross Street
Pittsburgh, Pa.

Field Instructor: Mrs. Kay Hamilton
Faculty Consultant: Mr. Gary Theilen

Mr. Paul Mooney	900 Willowdale Road	Elliott
-----------------	---------------------	---------

APPALACHIAN MENTAL HEALTH CENTER
P. O. Box 1170
Elkins, West Virginia

Field Instructor: Mr. Paul Enoch
Faculty Consultant: Mr. Harold White

Mr. William Armentrout	820 Naomi Street	Theilen
Miss Phyllis McCloud	Box 56, Mt. Clare, W. Va. 26408	Herbison
Mrs. Betsy Johnson	451 Brockway Avenue	Theilen

FIELD INSTRUCTION ASSIGNMENTS

page 5

WEST VIRGINIA HUMAN RESOURCES ASSOCIATION

300 Second Street
Fairmont, West Virginia 26554

Field Instructor: Mr. Walter Case;
Mrs. Bea Hunter
Faculty Consultant: Dr. Robert Porter
Miss Caroline Mudd

STUDENT	ADDRESS	ADVISOR
Miss Linda Carelli	474 Winsley	Herbison
Mr. Larry Beckett	Box 178, Fairview	White
Mr. James Frola	604 Elmira	Elliott
Mr. William McNitt	Box 6, Point Marion, Pa.	Mudd

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL

Clarksburg, West Virginia

Field Instructor: Mr. Carl Benedum
Faculty Consultant: Miss Caroline Mudd

Miss Ann Minsky	3601 Collins Ferry Rd, Apt. G28	Theilen
Mr. Willis Rawl	947 Maple Drive, #41	Herbison

COMMUNITY SERVICES OF PENNSYLVANIA

300 North Second Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Field Instructor:
Faculty Consultant: Dr. Marjorie Buckholz

Mr. Erik Wittman	209-2 Pierpont House	Elliott
------------------	----------------------	---------

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL

1540 Spring Valley Drive
Huntington, West Virginia

Mr. Eric Cutlipp
Field Instructor: Mr. Robert Ewing
Faculty Consultant: Mrs. Helen Ellison

Miss Lucky Lee Jones	474 Winsley	Herbison
Miss Ardath Angel	939 Maple Park Drive	Mudd

FEDERAL REFORMATORY FOR WOMEN

Alderson, West Virginia

Field Instructor: Mrs. Virginia Wilson
Faculty Consultant: Mr. Harold White

Mr. Gary Mancuso	295 Falling Run Road	White
------------------	----------------------	-------

MON VALLEY UNITED HEALTH SERVICE

Eastgate 8
Monessen, Pennsylvania 15062

Field Instructor: Mr. Joseph DeOto;
Mr. Joseph Havrilla
Faculty Consultant: Mr. Don Magel

Mr. Louis Marold	306 Oakland Street	Theilen
------------------	--------------------	---------

FIELD INSTRUCTION ASSIGNMENTS
page 6

FAIRMONT CLINIC
Fairmont, West Virginia

Field Instructor: Mrs. Karen Harper
Faculty Consultant: Mr. Harold White

STUDENT	ADDRESS	ADVISOR
Mr. Boyd Guenther	138 W. Bellcrest Ave., Pgh, Pa.	Mudd
Miss Margaret Homan	765 Garrison Avenue	Mudd

THE NEW LIFE, INC.
P.O. Box 1162
Steubenville, Ohio

Field Instructor: Mr. John Klenowski
Faculty Consultant: Mr. Gary Theilen

Sister Theresa Novak	Box 1000, Van Voorhis Road	Theilen
----------------------	----------------------------	---------

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL HOSPITAL
P. O. Box 1149
Beckley, West Virginia

Field Instructor: Mr. Mel Henry
Faculty Consultant: Mr. Harold White

Mr. Ron Burris	Rt. 8 Mileground, Apt. 6	Theilen
----------------	--------------------------	---------

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES, OFFICE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE
109 East 15th Street
New York, New York 10003

Field Instructor:
Faculty Consultant: Dr. Marjorie Buckholz
Dtr. of Training: Mr. Reginald Holder

Mr. George Tynes	8251 Gerrard Ave. 1-A Bronx, N.Y.	Herbison
------------------	-----------------------------------	----------

CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICE OF WHEELING
Wheeling, West Virginia

Field Instructor: Mr. Palmer Ulman
Faculty Consultant: Mrs. Helen Ellison

Mr. Joseph DesPlaines	Box 382, Waynesburg, Pa.	Stewart
-----------------------	--------------------------	---------

MULTI-CAP, INC.
Box 3228
Charleston, West Virginia 25332

Field Instructor: Miss Dorothy Halstead
Faculty Consultant: Dr. Dan Rubenstein

Mr. William Downs		Schneider
-------------------	--	-----------

WEST VIRGINIA REHABILITATION CENTER
Institute, West Virginia 25112

Field Instructor: Mrs. Elizabeth Minton
Faculty Consultant: Dr. Dan Rubenstein

Miss Barbard McNair	813 Arnold Apartments	Mudd
---------------------	-----------------------	------

Students placed in WALES are: Miss Jacqueline Apone, Mr. Donald Kemp, and
Mr. Richard Leepson. Faculty Consultant: Dr. Victor Schneider